

BRUNSWICK-KROESCHELL COMPANY

REFRIGERATING AND ICE MAKING MACHINERY
POWER AND HEATING BOILERS

BRUNSWICK PLANT
NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.

KROESCHELL PLANT
4221 DIVERSEY AVE., CHICAGO, ILL.

REPLYING TO YOUR
COMMUNICATION OF

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.

Aug. 30, 1926.

Mr. Timothy Pfeiffer,
c/o Mrs. Frances Hall,
Nichol Avenue,
New Brunswick, N.J.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer:

ALL AGREEMENTS ARE CONTINGENT UPON DELAYS OF WHATEVER KIND OR CHARACTER UNAVOIDABLE OR BEYOND OUR CONTROL, AND PRICES ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE.

I enclose herewith copy of letter dated August 21st from I. Gordon, of the Ohio Gas Range Company, also copy of his letter of August 26th. He has requested me in each case to return the originals to him and this I have done. I have written and thanked him for his assistance, telling him that I do not think it advisable to make any definite comments at this time but that I hope to have the pleasure of seeing him some time in the future.

Very truly yours,

S. B. Carpenter (10)

SBC:LIS

C - O - P - Y

105.1003 p2

OHIO GAS RANGE COMPANY
776 Third Ave.
New York City.

Aug. 21, 1926.

Mr. Sydney B. Carpenter Esq.
New Brunswick, N.J.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

I received your letter of the 20th, wherein you express your feeling in the interest I have taken in your present sorrow. It is impossible for any human being with a heart and soul to stand by and act neutral in such a matter. It seems to me that every good citizen should rise, and if possible, make some of the people show cause for their acts.

THE PIG WOMAN

She refused to tell where she was born. Her answer, "Somewhere in Kentucky". Kentucky mountaineers are historically known for the feuds between different clans who, no doubt, think very little of taking life. SHE HAS A REASON FOR REFUSING TO NAME HER BIRTHPLACE AND HER BIRTHPLACE MUST BE KNOWN.

She explains her presence at Phillip's Lane on account of following a possible corn thief, which in itself is ridiculous, since she admits that this rickety wagon had been going on its way home. Moreover, Mr. Ehrling, who was there before and after the pig woman came, saw her coming but denies the presence of a rickety wagon. All of the other witnesses who claim having seen the pig woman there also deny the presence of a rickety wagon. It is, therefore, obvious that her lie covers a hidden crime.

She flashed a man and woman first, then she comes up, stops alongside of an automobile and looks in to identify the occupants, then she goes right back into brush, hides her mule, ties him up and walks up to the very place where the crime was committed. This place has been known, as some people express themselves, as lovers' lane for married people. It is, therefore, obvious that blackmail or robbery, or both was the motive. She admits carrying a revolver. To cut corn and to kill pigs requires a heavy sharp knife.

A blackmailer runs a risk of being attacked by the parties whom they try to blackmail, and if the blackmailer should happen to be armed with a knife and gun, results similar to this, no doubt follows.

One of the witnesses, a doctor, substantiates my theory. He states that the location where the bullet went in and the exit of the bullet indicates as though the victim, with head down, made an attack upon the murderess. This would account for the first shot and followed by three more shots into the other victim, who, no doubt jumped to assist.

The pig woman's house should be thoroughly searched and a warrant for her arrest issued. Things may be found which may lead to discoveries of this case and probably other holdups.

I can point out many other facts which, no doubt, would direct justice to the proper guilty party. However, I believe that your attorneys can follow the matter up as well as I can.

Please copy and return this letter. I sincerely hope that your relatives will soon be able to turn the table against their oppressors.

Very truly yours,

(signed) I. Gordon.

IG;RG

OHIO GAS RANGE COMPANY
776 Third Avenue
New York City

Aug. 26, 1926.

Mr. S.B. Carpender, Esq.
New Brunswick, N.J.

Dear Sir:

The new evidence of fingerprints is about the limit. I read in the paper that the card was not the same one found four years ago but that a new card was found on the premises.

It seems to me that the one who has ransacked the victim's pockets and found papers has thrown them away. No doubt these cards were among the papers and that before the victims were found, the wind blew up these cards against the victims.

Your opponents are trying to show that it was done by hand which no sane mind could believe the possibility of any man, under such conditions, having nerve enough to do that. They try to show the motive being so that the victims would be identified. Again I say, would any man or woman, under such conditions, have enough presence of mind to do that? Moreover, in a little town like New Brunswick, the victims would be identified immediately and there is no reasoning which would cause the act under such conditions to assure identification.

Four years ago, after so much handling, fingerprints would long before erase on these cards. Dont you think that it is possible for any one to obtain a card with the victim's name on or have one printed and copy fingerprints through some possible medium?

If this can be shown, conspiracy can be shown at the same time. Who is the New Brunswick party claiming to have found a card and placed it in a wall? Why didn't he turn it over before or right at the time the first case was tried. The card would not have laid around in the brush or in the grass any length of time and show fingerprints. The elements would certainly erase every sign of fingerprints or any other mark on it. How long after the victims were found did that man find a card?

It seems to me that I would employ one shrewd detective to ferret these things out. The presence of Judge Clary with Judge Parker, while he was deciding upon the bail question does not look well. There is a lot more I could say and call your attention to; however, I would refrain to do so in letter form.

I hope this may be of some help to you. Kindly return this letter.

Very truly yours,

(signed) I. Gordon.

IG:RG

(Over)

P.S. Is it possible that some one, prior to the trial had in a way handed Dr. Hall's card to Mr. Stevens under some pretence or with some remark and Mr. Stevens would be apt to take this card in his hands and then give it back. In other words, does Mr. Stevens remember any one ever saying to him in words or substance:

"Here is a card, do you recognize the name or do you know who it belongs to?" And did Mr. Stevens take the card in his hands and then give it back? If this can be discovered and brought out in evidence, I believe there would be cause of action against your opponents.

I.G.